

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Final Office Action mailed June 30, 2010. At the time of the Final Office Action, Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-12 were pending in this Application. Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-12 were rejected. Claims 2, 7 and 13-14 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3-6 and 8-11 were rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent No. 6,011,537 issued to Benjamin Slotznick ("*Slotznick*") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,687,737 issued to Rick W. Landsman et al. ("*Landsman*").

Claim 12 was rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Slotznick* in view of *Landsman*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,656,804 issued to Edward Barkan et al. ("*Barkan*").

Applicants respectfully traverse and submit the cited art combinations, even if proper, which Applicants do not concede, does not render the claimed embodiment of the invention obvious.

In order to establish a prima facie case of obviousness, the references cited by the Examiner must disclose all claimed limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (C.C.P.A. 1974). Even if each limitation is disclosed in a combination of references, however, a claim composed of several elements is not proved obvious merely by demonstrating that each of its elements was, independently, known in the prior art. *KSR Int'l. Co. v. Teleflex Inc.*, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). Rather, the Examiner must identify an apparent reason to combine the known elements in the fashion claimed. *Id.* "Rejections on obviousness grounds cannot be sustained by mere conclusory statements; instead, there must be some articulated reasoning with some rational underpinning to support the legal conclusion of obviousness." *Id.*, citing *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988 (Fed. Cir. 2006). Finally, the reason must be free of the distortion caused by hindsight bias and may not rely on ex post reasoning. *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1742. In addition, evidence that such a combination was uniquely challenging or difficult tends to show that a claim was not obvious. *Leapfrog*

Enterprises, Inc. v. Fisher-Price, Inc. and Mattel, Inc., 485 F.3d 1157, 1162 (Fed. Cir. 2007), citing *KSR*, 127 S.Ct. at 1741.

The Examiner stated that *Slotznick* allegedly discloses all the limitations of independent claims 1 and 8 with the exception of a timer that automatically prevents switching back to the first element. Applicants respectfully disagree.

The independent claims include the limitation of :

receiving a plurality of data configured for simultaneous display from an information source;
prior to displaying the received data, separating the received data into a plurality of elements;

According to this limitation, a plurality of data is received from a single source. Upon receipt of this plurality of data, the received data is separated into a plurality of elements. *Slotznick* neither discloses nor suggests this limitation. According to *Slotznick*, the information provided for displaying at a display includes a primary and a secondary information. (*Slotznick*, col. 4, lines 39-42) The primary information and the secondary information are retrieved from different devices. (*Slotznick*, col. 4, lines 42-47) Thus, according to *Slotznick* two different sources are necessary to transmit the primary and secondary information. *Slotznick* does not disclose receiving a plurality of data from a single source and separating the data. No separation of data is necessary in the system of *Slotznick* as the primary and secondary information are retrieved from entirely different sources. Moreover, because the primary and secondary information are coming from different sources they are also not intended to be displayed in a single display. Contrary to such an arrangement, according to the present independent claims, the data received is intended to be displayed on a single screen. However, the system according to the present invention splits the received data into a plurality of elements to be displayed separately. See, for example, specification, page 5. None of the cited prior art discloses such a mechanism. On the contrary, *Slotznick* teaches the separate generation and reception of primary and secondary information and both separately received information have to be controlled in such a way that the primary information is displayed simultaneously with a part of the secondary information.

Hence, Applicants believe that all independent claims are allowable in view of the cited prior art. Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent Claims are allowable at least to the extent of the independent Claim to which they refer, respectively. Thus, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the dependent Claims. Applicants reserve the right to make further arguments regarding the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), if necessary, and do not concede that the Examiner's proposed combinations are proper.

CONCLUSION

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place this case in condition for allowance in light of the remarks set forth above. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the pending claims.

Applicants believe there are no fees due at this time. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees necessary or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4871 of King & Spalding L.L.P.

If there are any matters concerning this Application that may be cleared up in a telephone conversation, please contact Applicants' attorney at 512.457.2025.

Respectfully submitted,
KING & SPALDING L.L.P.
Attorney for Applicants



Andreas H. Grubert
Registration No. 59,143

Date: August 30, 2010

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

KING & SPALDING L.L.P.

CUSTOMER ACCOUNT NO. **86528**

512.457.2025

512.457.2100 (fax)